

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-38 were originally submitted.

No Claims are added or amended.

Claims 1-38 remain in this application.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,430,576 to Gates et al. (Gates). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

Gates teaches methods and apparatuses for distributing and synchronizing objects. In particular, object or object copies across a network may be synchronize through the use of a policy that specifies when objects are synchronized. (Abstract of Gates; col. 3, lines 59-60).

Independent claim 1 recites “[a] method comprising:

generating a policy digest for a cached policy at a client, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying with; and

including the policy digest in a request by the client to access a resource.”

Gates fails to teach or disclose the elements of Claim 1. The Action argues that the element “generating a policy digest for a cached policy at a client” is disclosed by Gates, and particularly presents col. 3, lines 55-66 and col. 6, lines 36-44.

1 As discussed above, the policy or policies taught by Gates are used to
2 synchronize objects, and in particular, objects that are sent across a network. In
3 specific, the policy provides for synchronization upon compliance of specified
4 conditions. (Gates, col. 6, lines 42-43).

5 There is no teaching or disclosure in Gates as to a “policy digest” being
6 generated as recited in claim 1. Although a “policy” may be generated or provided
7 in Gates, there is no teaching or disclosure in Gates that the “policy” is ever cached
8 at the client as recited by claim 1. Nevertheless, if there is no teaching or
9 disclosure in Gates as to a “policy digest”, there is no teaching or disclosure as to a
10 “policy digest for a cached policy at a client”.

11 The Action argues that the element “the policy digest identifying at least
12 one assertion the client is complying with” is disclosed by Gates, and presents col.
13 6, lines 45-60. What is taught in this particular section of Gates is that a policy
14 may be based on one or more conditions. The cited section lists particular
15 examples of such conditions, such as number of messages processed, types of
16 messages, time based synchronization, etc., however, there is no teaching or
17 disclosure in this section or in Gates in general, as to “identifying at least one
18 assertion that client is complying” which is performed by the “the policy digest”.

19 The Action goes on to argue that the element “including the policy digest in
20 a request by the client to access a resource” is disclosed by Gates, and presents col.
21 6, lines 61-67. This particular section of Gates teaches that after policy conditions
22 are met, copies of objects may be synchronized with each other by transmitting
23 information necessary to reflect differences to a remote counterpart of an object.
24 The differences are then propagated or sent to other systems or copies of objects.
25 There is no teaching or disclosure in this section or Gates in general as to “request

1 by the client to access a resource” and particularly including with such a “request”
2 a “policy digest” as recited in claim 1.

3 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 1 and
4 the rejection of claim 1 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully
5 request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

6 **Dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8** depend from and comprise all the
7 elements of claim 1. As such, dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are allowable at
8 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicant respectfully
9 requests that the §102 rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

10 **Independent claim 9** recites “[a] method comprising:

11 extracting at a host a policy digest identifying a cached policy, the
12 policy digest included in a request to access a resource; and

13 denying access to the resource if the policy digest identifies an
14 invalid policy.”

15 Gates fails to teach or disclose the elements of Claim 9. The Action argues
16 that the element “extracting at a host a policy digest identifying a cached policy,
17 the policy digest included in a request to access a resource” is disclosed by Gates,
18 and particularly presents col. 3, lines 55-66 and col. 6, lines 36-44. As discussed
19 above, this section and Gates in general, teaches the use of policies in
20 synchronizing objects; however, as discussed above, Gates does not teach or
21 disclose a cached policy that is included in a request to access a resource.
22 Furthermore, the cited section does not teach “extracting at a host, a policy digest”
23 as recited in claim 1.

24 The Action argues that the element “denying access to the resource if the
25 policy digest identifies an invalid policy” is disclosed by Gates and particularly

1 presents Fig. 3, #304, col. 7, lines 1-14 and 50-61. As discussed above, Gates fails
2 to teach or disclose a “policy digest”. Furthermore, the cited section of Gates, is
3 directed distribution and synchronization of objects, where element 304 of Fig. 3 is
4 a decision if the “conditions of policy [are] met?” Col. 7, lines 1-14. This section
5 of Gates fails to teach identifying an invalid policy, and specifically denying
6 access to the resource if the policy digest identifies an invalid policy. The section
7 of Gates, col. 7, lines 50-61 disclose the mutation of copies of objects to provide
8 security; however, this section of Gates fails to disclose or teach the element of
9 claim 9 as argued by the Action.

10 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 9 and
11 the rejection of claim 9 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully
12 request that the §102 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

13 **Dependent claims 10, 11, 12 and 13** depend from and comprise all the
14 elements of claim 9. As such, dependent claims 10, 11, 12 and 13 are allowable at
15 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 9. Applicant respectfully
16 requests that the §103 rejection of claims 10, 11, 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

17 **Independent claim 15** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the
18 rejection of claim 9. Applicant asserts the arguments as presented in support of
19 claim 9 in support of claim 15.

20 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 15
21 and the rejection of claim 15 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant
22 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

23 **Dependent claims 16, 17, 18 and 20** depend from and comprise all the
24 elements of claim 15. As such, dependent claims 16, 17, 18 and 20 are allowable
25

1 at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 15. Applicant respectfully
2 requests that the §102 rejection of claims 16, 17, 18 and 20 be withdrawn.

3 **Independent claim 21** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the
4 rejection of claim 1. Applicant asserts the arguments as presented in support of
5 claim 1 in support of claim 21.

6 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 21
7 and the rejection of claim 21 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant
8 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

9 **Dependent claims 22, 23 and 25** depend from and comprise all the
10 elements of claim 21. As such, dependent claims 22, 23 and 25 are allowable at
11 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 21. Applicant respectfully
12 requests that the §102 rejection of claims 22, 23 and 25 be withdrawn.

13 **Independent claim 26** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the
14 rejection of claim 1. Applicant asserts the arguments as presented in support of
15 claim 1 in support of claim 26.

16 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 26
17 and the rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant
18 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

19 **Dependent claims 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33** depend from and comprise all
20 the elements of claim 26. As such, dependent claims 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 are
21 allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 26. Applicant
22 respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claims 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 be
23 withdrawn.
24
25

1 **Independent claim 34** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the
2 rejection of claim 9. Applicant asserts the arguments as presented in support of
3 claim 9 in support of claim 34.

4 Accordingly, Gates does not teach or disclose every element of claim 34
5 and the rejection of claim 34 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicant
6 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

7 **Dependent claims 35, 36 and 37** depend from and comprise all the
8 elements of claim 34. As such, dependent claims 35, 36 and 37 are allowable at
9 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 34. Applicant respectfully
10 requests that the §102 rejection of claims 35, 36 and 37 be withdrawn.

11
12 **35 USC § 103**

13 Claims 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, 27, 30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
14 as being unpatentable over Gates as applied to claims 1, 9, 15, 21, 26 and 34
15 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,519,764 to Atkinson et al.
16 (Atkinson). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims.

17 The Action presents that “Gates does not expressly disclose generating or
18 using a hash of the policy digest. However, Atkinson discloses a hash as claimed”.

19 Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1, and therefore include all the elements
20 of claim 1. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of
21 claim 1. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest;
22 however, Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited
23 methods of claims 2 and 6.

24 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
25 or suggest each and every element of claims 2 and 5. Thus, claims 2 and 5 are not

1 obvious over the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103
2 rejection of claims 2 and 5 be withdrawn.

3 Claim 14 depends from claim 9, and therefore includes all the elements of
4 claim 9. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of claim
5 9. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest; however,
6 Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited method of claim
7 14.

8 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
9 or suggest each and every element of claim 14. Thus, claim 14 is not obvious over
10 the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
11 claim 14 be withdrawn.

12 Claim 19 depends from claim 15, and therefore includes all the elements of
13 claim 15. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of
14 claim 15. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest;
15 however, Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited system
16 of claim 19.

17 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
18 or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Thus, claim 19 is not obvious over
19 the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
20 claim 19 be withdrawn.

21 Claim 24 depends from claim 21, and therefore includes all the elements of
22 claim 21. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of
23 claim 21. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest;
24 however, Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited system
25 of claim 24.

1 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
2 or suggest each and every element of claim 24. Thus, claim 24 is not obvious over
3 the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
4 claim 24 be withdrawn.

5 Claim 27 depends from claim 26, and therefore includes all the elements of
6 claim 26. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of
7 claim 26. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest;
8 however, Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited
9 computer program product of claim 27.

10 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
11 or suggest each and every element of claim 27. Thus, claim 27 is not obvious over
12 the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
13 claim 27 be withdrawn.

14 Claim 38 depends from claim 34, and therefore includes all the elements of
15 claim 34. As discussed above, Gates fails to teach each and every element of
16 claim 34. Atkinson is cited for its teaching the use of a hash for a policy digest;
17 however, Atkinson provides no assistance in light of Gates as to the recited
18 computer program product of claim 38.

19 In view of the above, the combination of Gates and Atkinson does not teach
20 or suggest each and every element of claim 38. Thus, claim 38 is not obvious over
21 the cited combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
22 claim 38 be withdrawn.
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/5/06

By:

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245